

Message

---

**From:** Rainer Lohmann [rlohmann@uri.edu]  
**Sent:** 8/24/2020 4:42:11 PM  
**To:** Strynar, Mark [Strynar.Mark@epa.gov]  
**CC:** Anna Robuck [anna\_robuck@uri.edu]; Cantwell, Mark [Cantwell.Mark@epa.gov]; McCord, James [mccord.james@epa.gov]; David Wiley [david.wiley@noaa.gov]  
**Subject:** Re: Final decision on ES&T manuscript es-2020-01951j.R1

Hi Mark et al,

we sent in the appeal to JF, with little hope, but I think it is important to remind her of the arbitrariness of her decision.

ENv Int is nex on our list - btw - ETC has no page charges any longer.

Indeed, we have no reason to revise, as the new reviews from EST gave us no such indication..

so, once we hear back from JF, we will proceed to Env Int.

thanks

rainer

On Mon, Aug 24, 2020 at 11:45 AM Strynar, Mark <[Strynar.Mark@epa.gov](mailto:Strynar.Mark@epa.gov)> wrote:

Anna,

Generally I would say a rebuttal with Jennifer Field is futile. I have done it in the past with poor results. However I think she needs to know where you stand so it is worth the effort just to state your case.

My opinion would be Environmental International over ETC (page charges) and Chemosphere. I am not sure what the impact factor is, however I had one rejected from ES&T and made little to no changes and sent to Env. Intl and was accepted with minor revisions. Also sometime who you get as a reviewer plays in here.

I think some of the decisions made at ES&T are quite arbitrary, and other journals treat you fairly with comparable impact factors and timeliness.

Mark

---

**From:** Anna Robuck <[anna\\_robuck@uri.edu](mailto:anna_robuck@uri.edu)>  
**Sent:** Friday, August 21, 2020 4:15 PM  
**To:** Cantwell, Mark <[Cantwell.Mark@epa.gov](mailto:Cantwell.Mark@epa.gov)>; Strynar, Mark <[Strynar.Mark@epa.gov](mailto:Strynar.Mark@epa.gov)>; McCord, James <[mccord.james@epa.gov](mailto:mccord.james@epa.gov)>; David Wiley <[david.wiley@noaa.gov](mailto:david.wiley@noaa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Rainer Lohmann <[rlohmann@uri.edu](mailto:rlohmann@uri.edu)>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Final decision on ES&T manuscript es-2020-01951j.R1

Hello all,

The seabird spatial comparison paper has been rejected by ES&T, unfortunately.

I exchanged emails about this from Rainer, and we plan to appeal or at least raise issue about the rationale used to reject the paper. The reviewers noted we did a good job responding to all previous review points. Based on the comments provided, it appears the study was rejected because of its use of an opportunistic sample set.

We feel the characterization of opportunistic samples as a fatal flaw is an arbitrary departure from ES&T precedent, as multiple papers published over the past few years and certainly the past ten years use opportunistically obtained samples. Virtually every paper involving marine mammals is opportunistic given regulatory constraints.

While this is unlikely to change the verdict, we feel it's worth a shot. If you have any points you believe I should include in this brief rebuttal, please do let me know. I'll work with Rainer on the draft and circulate a draft letter to the group before submitting. Otherwise, if you have other ideas about the next journal, please let me know. I believe we ETC and Chemosphere are on the table, but open to all suggestions.

Thanks, and hope everyone has a nice weekend!

Anna

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Environmental Science & Technology <[onbehalf@manuscriptcentral.com](mailto:onbehalf@manuscriptcentral.com)>

**Subject:** Final decision on ES&T manuscript es-2020-01951j.R1

**Date:** August 21, 2020 at 12:49:39 PM EDT

**To:** [anna\\_robuck@uri.edu](mailto:anna_robuck@uri.edu)

**Cc:** [field-office@est.acs.org](mailto:field-office@est.acs.org)

**Reply-To:** [field-office@est.acs.org](mailto:field-office@est.acs.org)

21-Aug-2020

Journal: Environmental Science & Technology

Manuscript ID: es-2020-01951j.R1

Title: "Legacy and Novel Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) in Juvenile Seabirds from the US Atlantic Coast"

Author(s): Robuck, Anna; Cantwell, Mark; McCord, James; Addison, Lindsay; Pfohl, Marisa; Strynar, Mark; McKinney, Richard; Katz, David; Wiley, David; Lohmann, Rainer

Dear Dr. Robuck:

Your revised and resubmitted manuscript underwent review by two of the original reviewers. In addition, the opinion of a second Associate Editor was sought in order to make a decision on your manuscript since the reviewers offered opinions and recommendations that differed significantly.

While Re-reviewer 1 is satisfied, Re-reviewer 2 maintains that there is a fundamental flaw in the study design that compromises the quality of the manuscript. The concern about study design was also apparent in the comments of the original Reviewer 2, who did not re-review your manuscript. In their comments to the Editorial Office, Re-reviewer 2 “thinks there is a place in the literature that uses opportunistic study design, but I do not think it fits in a high quality journal like ES&T.”

Based on the two rounds of review, the decision is to decline your manuscript because it does not meet reviewer expectations for the Journal. Please consider submitting your manuscript to the newest member of the Environmental Science & Technology family of journals, Environmental Science & Technology: Water.

I wish you much success in your future research. Thank you for your interest in publishing with Environmental Science & Technology.

Sincerely,

Dr. Jennifer A. Field  
Oregon State University  
Corvallis, Oregon 97331-7301

Phone: 541-737-1765

Fax: 541-737-0497

E-mail: [field-office@est.acs.org](mailto:field-office@est.acs.org)

Reviewer: 4

Comments:

Dear Editor,

I have reviewed the revised submission including the comment & response file for all of the reviewer feedback. I am satisfied with the current manuscript and feel the authors addressed every comment with amended text in the paper.

Reviewer: 1

Comments:

I think the authors did a nice job addressing the comments posed by the reviewers and the manuscript has been improved. I still have reservations regarding this being published in ES&T because of the opportunistic sampling design used. In my mind this does not fit with the journal's scope of a rigorous and robust paper and would fit better in a different journal.

I was glad to see the birds that were sampled via bycatch were caught via gillnet and not longline, as this kind of sampling could be problematic.

I understand the author's rationale to say Nafion BP2 and PFO5DoDA are quantitative information, but I do disagree with this assertion. Since these chemicals were provided from the producer, Chemours, and there is no purity information provided, I would say these are still semiquant. Especially since there are no mass labeled internal standards. Unless the authors did a purity assessment of the material provided, I still feel this should be given as semiquantitative data.

-----  
PLEASE NOTE: This email message, including any attachments, contains confidential information related to peer review and is intended solely for the personal use of the recipient(s) named above. No part of this communication or any related attachments may be shared with or disclosed to any third party or organization without the explicit prior written consent of the journal Editor and ACS. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or is not responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you have received this communication in error. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail, and delete the original message.  
Thank you.

--

Rainer Lohmann

Professor of Oceanography  
Director URI Superfund Research Center 'STEEP'

Graduate School of Oceanography  
University of Rhode Island  
South Ferry Road  
Narragansett, RI 02882, USA  
Tel:401-874-6612  
Fax:401-874-6811  
<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8796-3229>  
<https://web.uri.edu/gso/meet/rainer-lohmann/>  
<https://web.uri.edu/lohmannlab/>  
Water E2S2 (<http://web.uri.edu/watere2s2/>)